

Do these files -not those still secret, but those open from the first- prove that the FBI and the Secret Service both conducted definitive investigations and both reached conclusions diametrically opposed to that of the Commission -and from identically the same evidence? Yes, they do! Did both federal investigative agencies maintain their silence when the Commission concluded what the evidence each developed and the conclusions each reached proved impossible. Yes, each did. And did each agency report what happened to the Commission without accounting for all the shootings? Yes, each did that, too, the FBI failing to account even for all the injuries to the President!

But don't look for that in the Saturday Evening Post's apology for the federal government in its own whitewashing of how that government came into power -through this assassination.

Do these-the unsecret-files contain ~~xxxxxxx~~ proof that they were gutted of the most basic evidence of all - evidence that is redundantly required to be there and is not - and does the Saturday Evening Post know this? Both are true. The files have been gutted and the Post does know about it, having learned it from me, personally.

What better reason can there be for the total silence of the Post on these points than its knowledge of them?

What better proof can the Post have of the integrity of the files and "investigation" of the ~~xxxx~~ they represent than the unassailable proof that they have been gutted of the basic evidence about the assassination.